

widespread in that section. Since the end of World War II thousands of fish ponds have been built in this state. Parrot's feather has spread with the ponds. Many farmers have planted it in their ponds, only to regret it later. In several localities they have had to drain the ponds and bulldoze or drag out the interwoven mass of stems and roots.

MYRIOPHYLLUM HUMILE (Raf.) Morong. Brunswick County: small pond 5 miles south of Orton Plantation, May 21, 1949, *Radford 4304A*.

My collection extends the range of this species southward from Maryland. Fernald, 1950, reports it from Nova Scotia south to Pennsylvania and eastern Maryland. This species is very abundant in many of the "Carolina Bay" pools west of the Cape Fear River between Wilmington and Southport.

DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA.

SETARIA LUTESCENS AN UNTENABLE NAME

JOHN R. REEDER

IN 1914 Stuntz (in U. S. Bur. Pl. Ind. Inv. Seeds & Pl. Imp. 31: 83) published the combination *Chaetochloa lutescens* as the valid name for the common yellow foxtail which had long been known as *Setaria glauca* (L.) Beauv. (based on *Panicum glaucum* L., Sp. Pl. 56. 1753). In the above article, Stuntz contended that the binomial *Panicum glaucum* L. should be applied to the pearl millet which had been called *Pennisetum americanum* (L.) K. Schum., and he took up the name *Pennisetum glaucum* (L.) R. Br. for this species. Thus the oldest available name for the yellow foxtail, he concluded, was *Panicum lutescens* Weigel (Obs. Bot. 20. 1772). In 1916 F. T. Hubbard (in *Rhodora* 18: 232) transferred this name to *Setaria* to conform with the International Rules.

There was considerable discussion in the literature some years ago regarding the correct name for the yellow foxtail. Mrs. Agnes Chase (in *Amer. Jour. Bot.* 8: 41-49. 1921) discussed the problem in detail and concluded that the name *Panicum glaucum* L. applied to pearl millet and not to yellow foxtail.¹ Dr. Otto Stapf (in *Kew Bull.* 1928: 147-149. 1928) also reviewed the

¹ See also Hitchcock, A. S. in *Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb.* 22: 165. 1920.

problem and came to quite the opposite conclusion. Weatherby, Knowlton, & Bean in an article in *Rhodora* (31: 108–110. 1929) concur with the opinion of Stapf.

One has but to look into the floristic works published in this country in the past 30 years to see that the specific epithet *lutescens* has been generally adopted for the yellow foxtail. This has been due, in large measure, to the fact that workers at the United States National Herbarium have consistently used this name. The combination *Panicum lutescens*, however, has no standing under our present Rules. Actually, in describing the differences between two species of grasses which grew in the fields about Stralsund, Weigel merely remarks that he should have called one *lutescens* (“*lutescens nominaverim*”), while the other might answer to the name of *virescens*. Nowhere does he directly make the combination *Panicum lutescens*, although as pointed out by Weatherby *et al.*, in most cases he uses *Panicum* or *P.* before the specific name when citing the Linnaean species. At the International Botanical Congress held in Stockholm in 1950, the following new paragraph was added to Article 37: “A binomial or other combination is not validly published unless the author definitely indicates that the epithets are to be used in a certain combination.” This seems clearly to exclude Weigel’s mention of “*lutescens*,” since he did not use it in combination with a generic name.

Since the binomial *Setaria lutescens* (Weigel) F. T. Hubb. is untenable, what then is the correct name for the yellow foxtail? If we review *Panicum glaucum* L. again, there seems to be no reason why this name should be excluded. It is of some significance, I think, that the late M. L. Fernald, a careful student of nomenclature, has used *Setaria glauca* (L.) Beauv. for this plant in the new (1950) edition of Gray’s Manual. Among others the noted German agrostologist Dr. R. Pilger also uses it (in *Bot. Jahrb.* 74: 256. 1948). Since the majority of botanists in America, however, have followed the Washington group in the use of the untenable *Setaria lutescens*, it seems worthwhile to review the case for and against the use of *Panicum glaucum* for the yellow foxtail.

Both Mrs. Chase and Dr. Stapf have, in their papers, included a reproduction of Linnaeus’ treatment of *Panicum glaucum* as it

appears in Sp. Pl. p. 56. I present it once more here as it greatly facilitates discussion of the case to have this information before us.

Panicum spica tereti, involucellis bifloris fasciculato-pilosis. Fl. zeyl. 44.

Gramen alopecuroides maderaspatanum, spica quasi geniculata molli.

Pluk. alm. 177. t. 190. f. 6.

β *Gramen paniceum s. Panicum sylvestre, simplici spica. Scheuch. gram. 46.*

γ *Panicum spica simplici, aristis aggregatis flosculo subjectis. Gron. virg. 134.*

Panicum indicum altissimum, spicis simplicibus mollibus in foliorum alis, pediculis longissimis insidentibus. Tournef. inst. 515.

Habitat in Indiis.

Setae in spica longitudine flosculorum. Foliorum vaginae oris pilosae. Dum spica recens prodiit. Flosculi in series dispositi observantur.

As can be seen from the above, Linnaeus included under *Panicum glaucum* five name-phrases with references to their authors, an indication of the distribution of the grass, and a short description. There seems to be no disagreement among students of grasses that these phrases refer to different species. The first is clearly pearl millet, the second *Elytrophorus articulatus*, the third *Setaria viridis*, the fourth yellow foxtail, and the last is doubtful.

Dr. Stapf says that the Hermann plants of the Flora Zeylanica were probably returned to their owner and were not at Linnaeus' hand when preparing the Species Plantarum and hence Hermann's plants cannot be taken as types without further evidence. Such evidence is lacking in the case of *Panicum glaucum*, according to Stapf. On the other hand, Mrs. Chase holds that the name *glaucum* itself applies to the bluish head of pearl millet and not to the yellow head of the foxtail. Furthermore the description ("Bristles the length of the flowers," and "in the young spike the flowers are seen to be disposed in series") supplies the evidence that Linnaeus had a plant of pearl millet at hand. To these conflicting opinions, I should like to add that it does not take much imagination to see the spikelets on the spike of the foxtail arranged in rows. Also, there is something glaucous about a plant of yellow foxtail. In fact Mrs. Chase's colleague, the late A. S. Hitchcock (in Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 22: 166. 1920) states in a description of *Chaetochloa lutescens* that the leaves are often glaucous.

It seems to me that at this late date it would be difficult to prove what plant (or plants) Linnaeus had in his hand when he

wrote up *Panicum glaucum* for the Species Plantarum. We are all agreed that he included a mixture of 4 or 5 different species. What we should be interested in is what plant Linnaeus had *in mind* when he used the binomial. Fortunately, we have that information. Apparently Linnaeus soon became aware of the incongruity of *Panicum glaucum* in Sp. Pl. ed. 1, for in the tenth edition of his Systema Naturae (1758) he confined his *Panicum glaucum* to γ of the Species Plantarum, that is the *Panicum glaucum* or *Setaria glauca* of subsequent authors. In taking this action he was fulfilling the obligation of an author, who breaks up an heterogeneous group, of indicating to which part the original name should adhere in the future. Stapf states that Gronovius' plant (the basis for γ under *Panicum glaucum* in the Species Plantarum) is in the Linnean Herbarium labeled *P. glaucum* in Linnaeus' hand and is numbered 2, the number of the species in the first edition of the Species Plantarum. To quote Stapf: "There was now no longer any ambiguity as to what Linnaeus meant by his *Panicum glaucum* and the specimen in his herbarium which corresponded to the revised conception became its 'type'."

I wish to thank Dr. A. W. Evans for his helpful criticism of the manuscript.

OSBORN BOTANICAL LABORATORY, YALE UNIVERSITY

A NEW FORM OF RUBUS ALLEGHENIENSIS¹

LEONARD P. WOLFE, JR. AND ALBION R. HODGDON

RUBUS ALLEGHENIENSIS Porter, forma **rubrobaccus**, forma nov. Suffrutex, *R. allegheniensi* similis, sed fructibus longioribus cylindricis subrubrobrunneis, dulcissimis (vix acerbis), canis subflavo-viridibus differt.

One indeed should be brave to describe anything new in *Rubus*, particularly in the Blackberries. However, the authors feel that any genetically distinct entity, with very conspicuous features, and particularly with some attractiveness to the agriculturalist, should receive some recognition from the taxonomist.

This plant, although with many fundamental similarities to *Rubus allegheniensis*, differs strikingly from it in several ways.

¹ New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station Scientific Contribution 133.